

SUMMARY OF FLIP CHART NOTES FROM OCTOBER 3, 1997 MEETING OF CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM INTERAGENCY DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Alternative 1 Discussion

Environmental management will help determine off-aqueduct storage.

Storage: new numbers on chart are maximums.

Have considered effects of peat soils.

Habitat restoration: will have to be carefully planned a to area.

Alternative 1 will allow flexibility in operating gates. (Flow barriers)

ERPP will need 210,000 AF

Water Use Efficiency program assumes, based on future demand, 1MAF of urban conservation that can be described as "new water". This assumption requires discussion.

Must discuss assumptions: WUE assumes 150,000 AF of "new water" saved through agricultural conservation.

Transfers: Assumption 500,000 AF?

WUE and transfers yields are still unknown, numbers are best guesses.

Need further discussion of Common Programs.

What are the base assumptions for the water for the ERPP?

How much water do we need for the ERPP?

How are we measuring reliability? Average years and droughts (critically dry periods).
Reliability means different things to different people.

Do we maximize average annual yield or maximize annual deliveries? Yield during dry periods?

How do we measure reliability to choose between alternatives?

Can change operations, regardless of the alternative?

Will looking at average annual deliveries make Alternative 3 more attractive?

/

Need a clear goal to have viable alternatives for NEPA/CEQA analysis.

Optimize Alternative 1 for what?

Does Alternative 1 need operational flow control barriers?

What are assumptions behind decision to put in barriers?

Phasing issue: Meeting South Delta water agency needs before CALFED solution.

Will 15,000 cfs of screen capacity provide sufficient capacity to operate CVP & SWP at full capacity?

Discuss concerns with Tracy screens.

Do they improve water quality?

Do they help with fish management?

Is alternative being driven by fish screens?

Alternative should come up with diversion capability to allow pumps to operate at full capacity.

Do we agree that we need best feasible technology fish screens to pump at full capacity?

Is the goal of the alternative to pump at full capacity? What is full capacity?

Should there be a regulatory standard to limit the capacity of the pumps?

How are we proposing to operate the system to meet the delivery goals?

Do we assume the existing water quality standards, or do we proposed new standards?

What are the standards we are operating under for all the alternatives?

What are the expected benefits/outputs of the alternatives?

Addressed in the Distinguishing Characteristics.

Is Alternative 1 over designed?

What are the alternative ways to deliver water?

Can we maximize ERPP benefits by moving screens (Tracy/Victoria Island)?

Alternative 2 Discussion

Issue on which no consensus exists: Is the goal to maintain positive (towards ocean) net flows on the San Joaquin and Mokelumne Rivers?

2

Do positive net flows make a difference in South part of the Delta?

Should Hood intake be screened?

Issue: Attraction of fish to back side of screen at Hood.

Can environmental benefits be achieved with the "small" opening to Canal Ranch and Bract Tract wetland areas?

Discuss with experts: "Larger opening" downsides: can create high velocities and high impacts.

Issue: Flow issues related to depositing spoils from Victoria Island to Franks Tract (transfer of peat) as a key part of Alternative 2.

Are screens driving the alternatives? If so, the screens may limit choices for design and implementation of the alternatives.

Issue: Should alternatives be optimized or should the alternatives represent a range of options?

Alternatives are significantly different relative to the level of investment.

Recommendations of fish screen committee: Should fish screens be built at the intake of the CC Forebay?

Fundamental assumptions need to be discussed for all alternatives.

Paper trail related to screening in South Delta:

- assumptions
- effectiveness
- options

Will expanded forebay intake capacity need to be increased for agricultural diversions?

Define goals and assumptions for alternatives.

- Water supply
- Deliveries
- ERPP

Do we use cost as an early screening criterion?

Do options, or combinations of them, affect decisions on the amount of storage to include in the alternative?

Modeling cannot capture all nuances, need qualitative assessments.

Should storage be optimized? Is this the purpose of the IDT? Water supply outputs may help

determine amount of needed storage.

Must compare modeling results with "real world"

How constrained should alternative options be? Lots of flexibility raises assurances issues.

Alternative 3 Discussion

What is benefit of designating future storage as "possible"? Implications: to current landowners, land values, etc.

What ^{are} ~~is~~ the purposes of diversions?

Are current multiple intakes needed?

Look at alternative intake locations to Victoria Island.

Relocate Hood intake?

Intakes at tip of Bacon Island and Roberts Tract.

Should users along Isolated Facility (IF) have diversions from the facility?

Remember that facilities will be phased.

In-Delta storage locations should be explicit.

Should designated In-Delta storage be in Alternative 1?

How much fresh water is needed from the South Fork of the Mokelumne for local water users (Delta farmers)

Who on the East side of the Delta sees the IF as a new supply and where do they currently get their water? City of Stockton? Stockton East WD?

Flag for Policy Group: Should the project provide water to those who currently don't get water from the Delta?

What is the goal relative to the purpose of the IF?

Decide on locations and size of diversions.

Is Tracy diversion in addition to new diversions?

What is the purpose of the Tracy diversion?

Should In-Delta diversions from the South Delta be eliminated?

Diversion on Victoria Island does not give flexibility.

4

The alternative look more like 3I.

Should South Delta be set aside for habitat or diversions?

Need ecological/diversion flexibility.

Can flexibility presented by IF eliminate need for some/all of the South Delta barriers?

Core group issue: Can Old River be used for fish passage?

Key issue: Has group accepted 15,000 cfs at intake points? If so, does this meet CALFED objectives? Is the issue the capacity for diversions or total amount of water to be diverted?

October 6 IDT Meeting Agenda

- Clarify CALFED Purpose
 - (Lester)
 - Frame Issues/Questions to Policy Group
 - How to Define Water Supply Reliability (re: CALFED Objectives)
- How to move forward with IDT Work
- How Water Use Efficiency and other programs fit into water supply reliability
- What are the assumptions and expected outcomes from the alternatives?
- Assumptions used to formulate alternatives?
- Explain differences in common programs relative to alternatives.

1003MTG

5